DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 842 CE 000 055

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Porter, Lyman W.; And Others |
| TITLE | Unit Performance, Situational Factors, and Employee Attitudes in Spatially Separated Work Units. |
| INSTITUTION | California Univ., Irvine. Graduate School of Administration. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office. |
| REPORT NO | TR-18 |
| PUB DATE | Aug 73 |
| NOTE | 39p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Banking; Clerical Workers; *Employee Attitudes; Employment; Factor Analysis; Job Satisfaction; *Organization; *Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; Performance Specifications; *Task Performance; Work Attitudes; Work Environment |

ABSTRACT

This study investigated relationships between work unit performance, employee attitudes, and situational characteristics among 411 female clerical workers in 37 branch banks. The work units were characterized by spatial separation and performance of similar functions. Two independent dimensions of performance were empirically identified and their relationship to attitudes and situational characteristics studied within a multivariate framework by means of multiple discriminant analysis. Results indicate that employee attitudes were significantly related to branch performance. Employees in high performance branches had higher attitude levels toward them and the larger organization of which they were a part while individuals in low and medium performing branches had lower attitude levels. Situational characteristics of the branch were most highly related to the manager's performance of loan functions, a large portion of which may take place outside the branch. Ten tables are included. (Author/MS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO

ED 080842

# UNIT PERFORMANCE, SITUATIONAL FACTORS AND EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES IN SPATIALLY SEPARATED WORK UNITS

LYMAN W. PORTER

ROBERT DUBIN

RICHARD T. MOWDAY

C E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Technical Report No. 18

August, 1973

INDIVIDUAL-ORGANIZATIONAL LINKAGES

Project Directors

Robert Dubin

Lyman W. Porter

*University of California*
*Irvine, California 92664*

CE 000 055

Prepared under ONR Contract N00014-69-A-0200-9001

NR Number 151-315

*Distribution of this document is unlimited.*
*Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.*

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

**DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D**

*(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)*

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)

University of California
Graduate School of Administration
Irvine, California

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

2b. GROUP

3. REPORT TITLE

UNIT PERFORMANCE, SITUATIONAL FACTORS AND EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES IN SPATIALLY SEPARATED WORK UNITS

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

Scientific Report #18

5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)

Lyman W. Porter, Robert Dubin, and Richard T. Mowday

6. REPORT DATE

August 1973

7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES

31

7b. NO. OF REFS

18

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.

N00014-69-A-0200-9001 NR 151-315

b. PROJECT NO.

c.

d.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

Technical Report #18

9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)

None

10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Distribution of the document is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY

Personnel and Training Research Programs
Office, Office of Naval Research

13. ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between work unit performance on the one hand, and employee attitudes and situational characteristics on the other hand, among 411 female clerical workers in 37 branches of a bank. The branches are work units characterized by spatial separation and the performance of similar functions. Two independent dimensions of performance were empirically identified and their relationship to attitudes and situational characteristics studied within a multivariate framework by means of multiple discriminant analysis.

The results indicate that employee attitudes were significantly related to a measure of branch performance reflecting job duties performed within the branch. Employees in branches rated high in performance had a high level of attitudes toward aspects of both the branch in which they work and the larger organization of which it is a part, while individuals in low and medium performing branches had a lower level of attitudes that was similar. Situational characteristics of the branch were most highly related to the manager's performance of loan functions, a large portion of which may take place outside the branch.

DD FORM 1 NOV 65 1473 (PAGE 1)

S/N 0101-807-6811

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

A-31408

| 14 KEY WORDS | LINK A | | LINK B | | LINK C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ROLE | WT | ROLE | WT | ROLE | WT |
| Work Unit Performance | | | | | | |
| Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Organizational Commitment | | | | | | |
| Organizational Attachment | | | | | | |
| Clerical Employees | | | | | | |
| Situational Characteristics | | | | | | |

# UNIT PERFORMANCE, SITUATIONAL FACTORS AND EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES IN SPATIALLY SEPARATED WORK UNITS

Lyman W. Porter, Robert Dubin, and Richard T. Mowday[1]

University of California, Irvine

The increase in the number of organizations characterized by a large number of spatially separated work units performing essentially similar functions, especially in the service related industries, directs attention to our limited understanding of the correlates of unit performance. Such multiple operating unit organizations are of analytical interest because their unique structural characteristics may have consequences for the relationship between the attitudes of employees and unit performance. The spatial separation of work units and the relative absence of unit interdependence can be viewed as creating clearly defined subsystems within the organization. As a consequence, the attitudes held by employees toward the larger organization may differ from the attitudes toward the unit in which they work. Further, employee attitudes toward the work unit and the overall organization may be differentially related to the performance of the work unit.

Considerable research attention in the past has been directed toward the relationship between the attitudes held by work groups and their performance as a unit. Unfortunately, the results of this research have not been conclusive (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964). Studies conducted in a variety of organizational settings have found few variables--either attitudinal or situational--that consistently distinguish between high and low performing work groups. The relationships found are generally weak and consequently of limited predictive value.

Most studies of group attitudes and performance have not been conducted in organizations composed of spatially separated but similar work units. Rather, previous studies have primarily used the department, division, or other structural grouping of employees at a single location of an organization as the unit of analysis. In studies conducted in spatially separated work units, interest has centered around a limited range of attitudes toward the work group or immediate work environment. Attitudes such as employee perceptions of supervisory behavior, satisfaction or morale, and work group cohesiveness appear to have received primary research attention (Comrey, Pfiffner, & Beem, 1952; Katz & Hyman, 1947; Katz, Maccoby, Gurin & Floor, 1951; Katzell, Barrett & Parker, 1961; Mann, Indik & Vroom, 1963; Parker, 1963). Little or no differentiation has been made in these studies concerning whether employee attitudes were focused toward the unit in which they work or toward the larger organization.

In addition, few studies of group performance and attitudes among spatially separated work units have also examined the influence of situational variables. The study by Katzell et al. (1961) is a notable exception, although the method they used of reporting results makes it difficult to determine the strength of the relationships they found. In a study not conducted among spatially separate work units, Ronan (1970) was only able to account for approximately 35% of the common variance in a factor analysis of the three types of variables. Further, he found little cross-loading between the variables. The effects of environmental or characteristics should be particularly clear among spatially separated work units since employees work in different locations and have limited contact among themselves.

The most common method of analysis in previous studies is a bivariate

correlational approach relating one or more performance measures to a large number of attitudes. Correlations between the attitude variable makes interpretation of the results of such analyzes difficult (Herman & Hulin, 1973; Tatsuoka, 1970). Parker (1963) and Ronan (1970) have used factor analytic techniques in the analysis of their group performance and attitude data. However, rather than use a technique that forms linear combinations of the attitude and performance variables that maximizes the common variance between them,it may be more appropriate to use a statistical technique that forms linear combinations of the attitude variables that maximally distinguishes between different levels of the performance variable. Since the analytical question concerns what characteristics best differentiate between different levels of performance, multiple discriminant analysis may provide a more straightforward method of analysis.

The analytical concern of this study is whether employees in work units rated high in performance have a different set of attitudes toward aspects of the unit in which they work and/or the larger organization than employees in work units rated low in performance. The analysis has several related purposes: to determine whether certain employee attitudes are more highly related to measures of unit performance than others; to examine whether a differential relationship exists between unit performance and employee attitudes focused at the level of the work unit and the overall organization; and, to determine the relationship of various situational characteristics to the level of unit performance.

## Method

### Subjects

The study was conducted among 37 branches of a large California bank.

The branches studied comprised one geographic region of the bank's operations. However, the branches were geographically separated within the region. The branches constitute distinct sub-units of the bank that are comparable in operations and function.

The sample was composed of 411 female non-supervisory employees who were employed in a variety of clerical jobs including Teller, Proof Operator, Bookkeeper, and Secretarial positions. A majority of individuals in the sample were under 30 years of age and had received at least some college education. The average tenure of subjects in the bank was under five years.

Branches ranged in size from a new branch containing five employees to a well established metropolitan branch containing 51 employees. Within each branch only those employees engaged in non-supervisory clerical functions were asked to participate in the study. In this way it was felt that a high degree of homogeneity among branches could be maintained with respect to the jobs held by employees since large branches do not differ greatly from smaller branches in the type of functions performed by employees. Rather, large branches differ primarily in the number of individuals performing a limited range of functions.

Data Collection

Each branch was visited by a member of the research team prior to the collection of data. The purpose of the visit was briefly to explain the objectives of the study to the Branch Manager and to secure his cooperation and support in encouraging the participation of employees. Questionnaire administration was conducted within each branch by a researcher. Subjects were given verbal instructions during which the voluntary nature of participation and the confidentiality of results were stressed.

Attitude Measures

The three attitude instruments used in the study are described below.

Organization commitment. A fifteen-item Likert-type questionnaire was used to measure the strength of the respondent's commitment to the overall organization. The instrument focuses on several aspects of commitment to the organization: desire to remain a member of the organization; willingness to exert high levels of effort on behalf of the organization; and, belief in and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization. Each item is a statement to which the respondent is asked to indicate agreement on a seven point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The wording of six items is reversed as a measure to eliminate response set bias. The score for overall commitment to the organization was computed for each respondent by averaging across the fifteen items.

The organizational commitment instrument has been used in a number of studies conducted in a variety of organizational settings. It has been found to adequately differentiate groups that would be expected to be high in commitment to the organization (e.g., management trainees) from employees in rather tedious, dead-end positions that would be expected to have low commitment to the organization (e.g., copywriters in a retail organization). Reliability of the instrument as measured by coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) across previous samples ranges from a high of .93 to a low of .83. The reliability of the instrument for the present study was .89, as measured by coefficient alpha.

Sources of Organizational Attachment. A twelve item Likert-type questionnaire was used to measure the perceived influence of specific aspects of the job, work environment, and organization on the individual's desire to

remain with or leave the organization. Responses were measured for each of twelve potential sources of attachment on a seven-point scale ranging from "strong influence toward leaving" to "strong influence toward staying." Because of the purpose of the instrument, responses were not summed across the twelve items.

To reduce the number of variables under consideration, a principal axes factor analysis of the twelve items was conducted and the results rotated using Kaiser's (1958) Varimax technique. The four factor solution chosen for the purposes of this analysis accounted for 65% of the common variance. Factor loadings above .30 are reported in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

The pattern of factor loadings suggest four structurally based sources of perceived influence on employee attachment. The first factor clearly reflects the perceived influence that aspects of the branch work environment have on employee attachment. This factor is composed of several supervisory items, immediate work colleagues, and the effectiveness of the branch. The second factor is primarily composed of policies which originate at the level of the work unit. This factor represents the perceived influence of policies concerning salary, promotion, and job duties on employee attachment. The third factor reflects the perceived influence of the organization itself on attachment through its reputation, values, and overall effectiveness. Factor four is composed primarily of the perceived influence of the branch's geographical location, although immediate work colleagues also weakly loads on this factor.

Factor scores were calculated for each individual on the four sources of attachment factors by a method reported in Harman (1967).

Job Satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, & Hulin (1969) was administered to measure the individual's satisfaction with his job and work situation. The degree of satisfaction with five aspects of work was measured: co-workers on the job; the type of work; pay; opportunities for promotion; and, supervision.

Situational Measures

Situational measures of the branch work environment were obtained from executive personnel of the regional headquarters. The situational characteristics measured were chosen to reflect aspects of the branch work environment from the employees' perspective and thus would be expected to have relationships with employee attitudes and performance. For each branch, information was provided concerning the general age range of customers, average level of income of customers, and the type of locale in which the branch was located. From this information, two members of the research project developed categories into which each branch was classified on each of these three factors. The following classification scheme was used in this analysis: age of branch clientele was divided into three categories, (1) young, (2) medium, and (3) older clientele; average income level of branch clientele was divided into (1) low, (2) medium, and (3) high; and, branch location was divided into either (0) shopping center or (1) retail business district.

In addition, regional personnel rated the physical condition of the buildings housing each branch. The categories of excellent, good, or fair were used in these ratings. The age of each branch was measured in years and months since construction or last renovation. Demographic information

about each branch manager was obtained from company records. Measures were obtained on the age of each manager, whether or not he participated in the bank's management training program, his tenure in the bank, and his tenure in the branch. Finally, the size of each branch was recorded in terms of the total number of employees, including supervisory personnel.

Branch Performance Measures

Executive personnel of the regional headquarters rated each branch on five dimensions of performance. Branches were rated on employee relations, marketing, operations, loan performance, and leadership effectiveness. A principal axes factor analysis of the five ratings was performed to discover if a summary measure of branch performance could be constructed. Two unique performance factors resulted from the analysis that accounted for 70% of the common variance. The two factors were rotated using Kaiser's (1958) Varimax technique. Factor loadings above .30 are reported in Table 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

The performance factors resulting from the analysis suggest that two aspects of branch performance are clearly distinguishable. The first factor represents a summary evaluation of the branch's performance in providing customer services. The loading of marketing, operations, leadership effectiveness, and employee relations on this factor reflects the contribution of both employees and the manager in the overall performance of the branch. The second factor in clearly defined by loan performance. The high loading of the leadership effectiveness rating on this factor reflects the key role of the branch manager in the loan performance of a branch. The failure of

any rating reflecting the efforts of clerical employees to load on this factor suggests that loan performance is primarily dependent on the efforts of the manager. Thus, this factor might best be called branch manager's loan performance.

The cross-loading of the leadership effectiveness rating is thought to represent the differentiation between two aspects of the branch managers job. First, the branch manager has responsibility for supervising the operation of the branch and in leading the employees. These duties take place within the branch. Second, the manager has primary responsibility for making loans. These duties involve making contacts in the community and thus a large portion of these may take place outside the branch. Thus, the cross-loading of the leadership effectiveness rating can be interpreted as representing the differentiation between the manager's job duties that are internal to the branch (i.e., leadership of branch employees) from those duties that are primarily his own and which may be performed externally (i.e., making loans). This latter aspect of the branch manager's performance may be evaluated by central office executives as personal initiative and agressiveness summed up in leadership effectiveness.

Branch performance factor scores were calculated for each branch for use in subsequent analysis by a method reported in Harman (1967).

Data Analysis

A mean score on commitment to the organization, the five satisfaction measures, and four perceived sources of organizational attachment were computed for the 37 branches. The mean level of attitudes within a branch, along with the situational measures and two performance factors, provided the basis for subsequent analysis.

For purposes of analysis, branches were divided into high, medium and low performance groups separately on each of the performance factors. The value used for assignment of branches to a group was $\pm$ .5 standard deviations from the mean of each performance factor score distribution. For example, high performing branches were considered to be those who had a factor score that was .5 standard deviation or greater from the mean of the distribution.

Multiple discriminant analysis was performed by a method reported in Overall and Klett (1972). This technique finds the linear combination of attitude variables that best discriminates between predetermined groups formed on the basis of the "performance variable". Multiple discriminant analysis is analogous to a one-way analysis of variance performed on several criteria simultaneously (Cramer & Block, 1966). Interpretation of the discriminant weights allows conclusions to be drawn concerning the relative contribution of each variable in discriminating between groups.

To test for differential relationships between branch performance and the level of the organization at which employee attitudes were focused, attidudes were classified a priori by researchers into two categories: attitudes focused primarily at the level of the branch; and, attitudes focused primarily at the level of the overall organization. In subsequent analysis, attitudes focused at the level of the branch are satisfaction with supervision, co-workers, and the work itself, and the perceived influence of branch location and the branch itself on employee attachment. Attitudes focused at the level of the overall organization include overall organizational commitment, satisfaction with pay and promotion, and the perceived influence of organizational policies and the organization itself on employee attachment.

## Results

Eight multiple discriminant analyses were conducted: four for the branch performance factor and four for the branch manager's loan performance factor. Each analysis consisted of testing the power of one group of variables to distinguish between high, medium and low performing branches. The four groups of variables tested were: all attitudes; attitudes primarily focused at the level of the branch; attitudes focused at the level of the overall organization; and, situational characteristics. A measure of the total discriminable variance, which is approximately distributed as a chi-square variate when computed by the procedure in Overall and Klett (1972), was used to test the significance of individual discriminant functions. In addition, the total discriminatory power of the discriminant functions was calculated using Tatsuoka's (1970) multivariate extension of the estimated omega-squared. The omega-squared statistic can be interpreted as the percentage of variance in the discriminant space that can be explained by reference to group differences (Tatsuoka, 1970).

Group means on the original measurements are presented in Table 3 and 4 for attitudes and situational characteristics grouped by branch performance, and Tables 5 and 6 for attitudes and situational characteristics grouped by branch manager's loan performance.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Tables 3, 4, 5, & 6 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

### All Attitudes

The discriminant analysis of the branch performance factor and all attitude variables resulted in one discriminant function significant beyond

the .005 level with the total discriminatory power attributable to the first discriminant function being 43%. Thus, 43% of the variance in attitudes is explainable by reference to group differences in performance. The total discriminable variance and the standard form weighting coefficients for the first discriminant function are reported in Table 7. Groups means on the discriminant functions are reported in Table 8.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Tables 7 and 8 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The weighting coefficients suggest that performance groups are primarily differentiated on the basis of the level of commitment to the overall organization, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with promotion, and satisfaction with co-workers. Group means on the original measurements (Table 3) show that commitment and satisfaction with promotion prospects differentiate between all three performance groups, with high performing branches scoring highest on these variables and low performing branches receiving the lowest score. Medium performing branches had a score approximately mid-way between the scores for the high and low group. On the other hand, satisfaction with the work itself and co-workers primarily distinguishes low performing branches from medium and high performing branches. Low performing branches had the lowest score on these variables while there was little difference between the scores for medium and high performing branches.

Group means (Table 8) on the first discriminant function demonstrate that medium performing branches had a lower score than either the high or low performing groups. The means for the low and medium performing groups do not appear to differ significantly from each other. On the other hand,

the means of the low and medium performing groups appear significantly lower than the mean of the high performing group. Consequently, perhaps the most appropriate conclusion that can be made is that high performing branches are differentiated from low and medium performing with respect to their level of attitudes.

Attitude variables did not significantly discriminate between branches grouped on the branch manager's loan performance factor. Thus, it can be concluded that no relationship exists between the attitudes measured and this dimension of performance.

Branch Level and Organizational Level Attitudes

The analyses conducted to determine whether differential relationships existed between performance and the level of the organization at which employee attitudes were focused did not result in discrimination significant at the .05 level. No strong relationships were found between either attitudes focused at the level of the overall organization or attitudes focused at the level of the branch on the one hand, and the measures of branch performance and branch manager's loan performance on the other hand.

Situational Characteristics

The results of the analysis of situational characteristic as related to branch performance factor were not significant at the prescribed level. However, the first discriminant function approached a level of significance ($p<.10$) and thus a weak relationship was found to exist between situational characteristics and branch performance.

Discriminant analysis based on the situational characteristics resulted in significant discrimination between branches grouped on the branch manager's loan performance factor. One discriminant function was significant

at the .05 level with the total discriminatory power attributable to the first discriminant function being 34%. Total discriminable variance and the standard form weighting coefficients are presented in Table 9.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 9 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The weighting coefficients suggest that high, medium and low performing branches are differentiated on the basis of branch size, physical condition of the branch, age of the manager, and the age range of the branch clientele. Group means on the original measures show that high performing branches are differentiated from medium and low performing branches by being larger in size and having younger managers. On the other hand, medium performing branches are characterized by good physical condition and a younger clientele in comparison with high and low performing branches. The group means on the discriminant functions are presented in Table 10.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 10 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

## Discussion

Several findings of note have emerged from the results of the data analysis. However, before discussing these findings in more detail it is worthwhile briefly to comment upon the nature of the performance measures. An understanding of the two domains of performance reflected by each measure is useful in the interpretation of results.

The two performance factors represent independent dimensions of the overall performance of a branch. This is true both statistically and from

a more analytical standpoint. The dimensions of unit performance appear to differ with respect to the type of banking function that is being evaluated, the employees who perform the function, and the location in which the performance of the function may take place.

The "branch performance" measure represents an overall evaluation of branch employees in the performance of internal job duties that are primarily concerned with providing services to customers who come to the branch to transact business. Employee performance in providing such familiar bank services as checking accounts, savings accounts, and safe deposit boxes is represented by this measure of performance. Clearly, an aspect of this measure is the manager's performance of his leadership function with respect to employees and other internal supervisory activities.

The measure of the "manager's loan performance" represents an evaluation of the branch manager in job duties related to loaning money. This measure probably reflects an evaluation of such managerial attributes as initiative and aggressiveness in securing loan business and the manager's skills in dealing generally with non-employees. Many of these activities may take place outside the branch. For example, the manager may actively participate in a local civic organization as a means of making himself or herself known to individuals in the community who may be potential loan customers.

Results of the data analysis demonstrate a highly significant relationship between the branch performance measure and the level of employee attitudes within the branch. The level of employee attitudes was found to be most highly related to functions performed within the branch. The group means of the low and medium performing branches on the discriminant function were similar to each other while differing greatly from the mean of the

high performing group. High performing branches were characterized by employees who possess high levels of commitment to the organization and high levels of satisfaction with the work itself, opportunities for promotion, and co-workers.

When attitudes were examined separately according to the level of the organization at which they were primarily focused--the branch or the overall organization--it was evident that neither group of attitudes alone was strongly related to branch performance. This finding suggests that only when attitudes toward the branch and the overall organization are high is there likely to be a relationship with branch performance. In other words, employees in high performing branches have stronger positive attitudes toward both the branch in which they work and the larger organization of which it is a part, than do employees in low performing branches.

This finding is of particular interest given the structural nature of the organization studied. It suggests that the performance of spatially separated work units is related to a total set of employee attitudes that includes attitudes toward aspects of the organization that transcend the physical boundaries of the immediate work environment. Thus, for high levels of performance to be found it is important that employees have positive orientations toward such characteristics of the overall organization as its values, goals, reputation and policies together with positive attitudes toward such aspects of work in the branch as the work itself, supervision, and co-workers. The implication for unit managers in settings such as this is the importance of keeping employees informed on the goals of the larger organization as well as developing a efficient working environment within the branch.

In contrast to the type of variables that were found to be related to the branch performance measure, the manager's loan performance was found to be most highly related to situational characteristics of the branch and demographic characteristics of the manager. Thus, situational factors were more highly related to the manager's performance of job duties concerned with loaning money than were the attitudes held by employees. The absence of any relationship between the manager's loan performance and the level of employee attitudes is not surprising since a large portion of his loan functions are relatively detached from the daily work routine of most of the employees.

This finding serves to illustrate the fact that different managerial functions performed within and outside the immediate work environment of employees may have differential importance to employees. The attitudes of employees are related only to the manager's functional duties which directly affect employees and/or which take place within the immediate work environment of employees. This finding may hold for similar types of organizations where managerial job duties include several distinct functions and some of these functions are performed in locations different from the immediate work environment of employees.

The existence of independent dimensions of work unit performance has definite organizational implications, particularly for "service-type" organizations where work units are spatially separated and perform similar functions. Perhaps the most obvious implication is that global evaluations of the work unit become extremely difficult and, as a consequence, dangerous to make. As the number of dimensions of performance increase, such global evaluations are likely to become increasingly misleading and may result in

misdirected organizational actions. Evaluations of a work unit must be undertaken with several identifiable criteria in mind if an accurate evaluation is to result.

Organizational strategies for the selection and assignment of managers to work units are also likely to be affected by the existence of multiple dimensions of performance. Organizations that choose to maximize all aspects of performance in each branch would thus select and assign managers with a balance of relevant abilities in mind. However, the organization may alternatively follow a strategy of maximizing single aspects of performance in different work units and thus may select and assign managers on the basis of skills in one relevant area.

The differential relationships that independent dimensions of performance have with other variables also has organizational implications. Organizational interventions in the work unit designed to increase performance are likely to have the highest impact when directed toward aspects of the branch that are highly related to the relevant performance dimension. Interventions that are directed toward aspects of the branch that are unrelated to the dimension of performance in question are likely to little impact or unintended consequences. The findings of this study indicate that care must be taken by the organization in both assessing and attempting to influence work unit performance.

References

Brayfield, A. H. & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.

Comrey, A. L., Pfiffner, J. M., & Beem, H. P. Factors influencing organizational effectiveness I. The U. S. forest survey. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 307-328.

Cramer, E. M. & Bock, R. D. Multivariate analysis. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 604-617.

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.

Harman, H. H. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Herman, J. B. & Hulin, C. Managerial satisfactions and organizational roles: An investigation of Porter's need deficiency scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 118-124.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Kaiser, H. F. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.

Katz, D. & Hyman, H. Morale in war industry. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1947.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. Productivity, supervision and morale among railroad workers. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1951.

Katzell, R. A., Barrett, R. S., & Parker, T. C. Job satisfaction, job performance, and situational characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961, 45, 65-72.

Mann, F. C., Indik, B. P., & Vroom, V. H. The productivity of work groups. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1963.

Overall, J. E. & Klett, C. J. Applied multivariate analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Parker, T. C. Relationships among measures of supervisory behavior, group behavior, and situational characteristics. Personnel Psychology, 1963, 16, 319-334.

Ronan, W. W. Individual and situational variables relating to job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54(1, Pt. 2).

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. J., & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Tatsuoka, M. M. Discriminant analysis: The study of group differences. Champaign, Il.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, University of Illinois, 1970.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964

## Footnotes

[1]This research was carried out under a contract from the Office of Naval Research (Contract No. N00014-69-A-0200-9001 NR 151-315)

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Joseph E. Champoux, Richard M. Steers, Eugene Stone, and William J. Crampon for their valuable assistance during various phases of this investigation.

TABLE 1

Factor Loadings

Sources of Organizational Attachment [a]

| Sources of Organizational Attachment Items | Factors | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Perceived Influence of Aspects of the Branch on Attachment | Perceived Influence of Organizational Policies on Attachment | Perceived Influence of Aspects of the Organization on Attachment | Perceived Influence of Branch Location on Attachment |
| Supervision's Response to Feelings | .81 | | | |
| Supervision's Structuring of the Work | .77 | | | |
| Reaction to Performance from All Levels | .64 | | | |
| Effectiveness of the Branch | .62 | | | |
| Immediate Work Colleagues | .41 | | | .37 |
| Effectiveness of the Overall Organization | .35 | .46 | .55 | |
| Promotion Prospects | .32 | .76 | | |
| Salary Prospects | | .81 | | |
| Job Duties | | .65 | | |
| Values of the Organization | | | .86 | |
| Reputation of the Organization | | | .83 | |
| Geographical Location of the Branch | | | | .91 |

[a]Only factor loadings above .30 are reported.

TABLE 2

Factor Loadings

Branch Performance Ratings[a]

| Branch Performance Ratings | Factors | |
|---|---|---|
| | Branch Performance | Branch Manager's Performance |
| Marketing | .85 | |
| Operations | .70 | |
| Loan Performance | | .97 |
| Leadership Effectiveness | .68 | .62 |
| Employee Relations | .64 | |

[a]Only factor loadings above .30 are reported.

TABLE 3

Branch Performance Factor:

Group Means on Attitudes

| Branch Performance Groups | Commit-ment | JDI Satisfaction | | | | | Perceived Sources of Organizational Attachment | | | | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Super-vision | Co-workers | Work | Pay | Pro-motion | Branch Itself | Org. Policies | Organi-zation Itself | Branch Loca-tion | |
| Low | 4.89 | 38.00 | 38.42 | 32.47 | 24.58 | 30.85 | -.28 | -.07 | -.15 | .01 | 10 |
| Medium | 5.17 | 42.88 | 43.08 | 35.92 | 26.03 | 33.97 | .09 | -.05 | -.00 | -.02 | 17 |
| High | 5.47 | 43.21 | 42.85 | 35.81 | 26.32 | 36.92 | .20 | .08 | .25 | .07 | 10 |

TABLE 4

Branch Manager's Loan Performance Factor:

Group Means on Attitudes

| Branch Performance Groups | Commitment | JDI Satisfaction | | | | | Perceived Sources of Organizational Attachment | | | | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Supervision | Co-workers | Work | Pay | Promotion | Branch Itself | Organizational Policies | Organization Itself | Branch Location | |
| Low | 5.23 | 42.59 | 42.95 | 34.77 | 24.00 | 34.90 | .01 | .01 | .09 | -.19 | 8 |
| Medium | 5.09 | 40.42 | 41.14 | 34.50 | 25.52 | 33.12 | -.09 | -.05 | -.04 | .16 | 17 |
| High | 5.25 | 42.76 | 41.85 | 35.74 | 27.14 | 34.41 | .18 | .01 | .09 | -.06 | 12 |

TABLE 5

Branch Performance Factor:

Group Means on Situational Measures

| Branch Performance Groups | Manager's Demographic | | | | Branch Measures | | | | | | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Age | Training | Tenure in Bank | Tenure in Branch | Age | Physical Condition | Size | Location | Age of Clientele | Income Level of Clientele | |
| Low | 48.4 | 1.8 | 21.5 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 2.1 | 24.4 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 10 |
| Medium | 41.8 | 1.6 | 16.9 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 15.0 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 17 |
| High | 39.9 | 1.7 | 15.0 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 16.3 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 10 |

TABLE 6

Branch Manager's Loan Performance Factor:

Group Means on Situational Measures

| Branch Performance Groups | Manager's Demographic Measures | | | | Branch Measures | | | | | | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Age | Training | Tenure in Bank | Tenure in Branch | Age | Physical Condition | Size | Location | Age of Clientele | Income Level of Clientele | |
| Low | 47.0 | 1.9 | 23.1 | 3.3 | 6.4 | 2.1 | 16.3 | .13 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 8 |
| Medium | 42.8 | 1.6 | 16.6 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 16.2 | .41 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 17 |
| High | 40.8 | 1.7 | 15.4 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 2.1 | 21.3 | .58 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 12 |

TABLE 7

Branch Performance:

Standard Form Discriminant Function Weights

on the First Discriminant Function of Attitudes

| Variable | Weight |
|---|---|
| Commitment to the Organization | 1.52 |
| JDI Work | -1.31 |
| JDI Promotion | 1.25 |
| JDI Co-workers | -1.07 |
| JDI Supervision | -.72 |
| Perceived Influence of the Branch on Employee Attachment | .57 |
| Perceived Influence of Organizational Policies on Employee Attachment | .50 |
| Perceived Influence of the Organization on Employee Attachment | .29 |
| JDI Pay | -.21 |
| Perceived Influence of Branch Location on Employee Attachment | -.06 |

TABLE 8

Branch Performance:

Group Means on the First Discriminant Function of Attitudes

| Group | Mean |
|---|---|
| Low Performance | -.69 |
| Medium Performance | -1.2 |
| High Performance | 1.1 |
| Total Discriminable Variance | 44.6 (20 df), $p<.005$ |

TABLE 9

Branch Manager's Loan Performance:

Standard Form Discriminant Function Weights

on the First Discriminant Function of Situational Characteristics

| Variable | Weight |
|---|---|
| Branch Size | .84 |
| Physical Condition of the Branch | .74 |
| Manager's Age | -.71 |
| Age of Branch Clientele | .64 |
| Income Level of Branch Clientele | -.52 |
| Manager's Tenure in Branch | -.43 |
| Training of Manager | .35 |
| Age of Branch | -.16 |
| Manager's Tenure in Bank | -.09 |
| Branch Location | -.05 |

TABLE 10

Branch Manager's Loan Performance:

Group Means on the First Discriminant

Function of Situational Characteristics

| Group | Mean |
|---|---|
| Low Performance | 1.3 |
| Medium Performance | .8 |
| High Performance | 2.6 |

Total Discriminable Variance 37.4 (20 df), $p<.05$

DISTRIBUTION LIST

NAVY

4 Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director
Personnel & Training Research Programs
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
495 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210
ATTN: C. M. Harsh

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91101
ATTN: E. E. Gloye

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
536 South Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60605
ATTN: M. A. Bertin

6 Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 2627
Washington, DC 20390

12 Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station, Building 5
5010 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Chairman
Behavioral Science Department
Naval Command and Management Division
U. S. Naval Academy
Luce Hall
Annapolis, MD 21402

1 Chief of Naval Technical Training
Naval Air Station Memphis (75)
Millington, TN 38054
ATTN: Dr. G. D. Mayo

1 Chief of Naval Training
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508
ATTN: CAPT Allen E. McMichael

1 LCDR Charles J. Thiesin, Jr., MSC, USN
4024
Naval Air Development Center
Warminster, PA 18974

1 Commander
Naval Air Reserve
Naval Air Station
Glenview, IL 60026

1 Commander
Naval Air Systems Command
Department of the Navy
AIR-413C
Washington, DC 20360

1 Dr. Harold Booher
NAVAIR 415C
Naval Air Systems Command
5600 Coumbia Pike
Falls Church, VA 22042

1 CAPT John F. Riley, USN
Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Amphibious School
Coronado, CA 92155

1 Special Assistant for Manpower
OASN (M&RA)
The Pentagon, Room 4E794
Washington, DC 20350

1 Dr. Richard J. Niehaus
Office of Civilian Manpower Mgmt.
Code 06A
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20390

1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN
COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14
NAS Miramar, CA 92145

1 Research Director, Code 06
Research and Evaluation Dept.
U.S. Naval Examining Center
Great Lakes, IL 60088
ATTN: C. S. Winiewicz

1 Program Coordinator
Bureau of Medicine & Surgery
(Code 71G)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20372

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Medical Neuropshcyiatric
Research Unit
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Technical Reference Library
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Chief
Bureau of Medicine & Surgery
Research Division (Code 713)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20372

1 Dr. John J. Collins
Chief of Naval Operations
(OP-987F)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20350

1 Technical Library (Pers-11B)
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20360

1 Head, Personnel Measurement Staff
Capital Area Personnel Office
Ballston Tower #2, Room 1204
801 N. Randolph Street
Arlington, VA 22203

1 Technical Director
Naval Personnel Research and
Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Bernard Rimland
Naval Personnel Research and
Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel Research and
and Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Supertindent
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 92940
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)

1 Mr. George N. Graine
Naval Ship Systems Command
(SHIPS 03H)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20360

1 Technical Library
Naval Ship Systems Command
National Center, Building 3
Room 3S08
Washington, DC 20360

1 Chief of Naval Training Support
Code N-21
Building 45
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

1 Dr. William L. Maloy
Principal Civilian Advisor for
Training and Education
Naval Training Command, Code 01A
Pensacola, FL 32508

1 CDR Fred Richardson
Navy Recruiting Command
BCT #3, Room 215
Washington, DC 20370

1 Mr. Arnold Rubinstein
Naval Material Command (NMAT-03424)
Room 820, Crystal Plaza #6
Washington, DC 20360

ARMY

1 Commandant
U.S. Army Institute of Administration
ATTN: EA
Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216

1 Armed Forces Staff College
Norfold, VA 23511
ATTN: Library

1 Director of Research
U.S. Army Armor Human Research Unit
ATTN: Library
Building 2422 Morade Street
Fort Knox, KY 40121

1 Commanding Officer
ATTN: LTC Montgomery
USACDC - PASA
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249

1 Commandant
United States Army Infantry School
ATTN: ATSIN-H
Fort Benning, GA 31905

1 U.S. Army Research Institute
Commonwealth Building, Room 239
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209
ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek

1 Mr. Edmund F. Fuchs
U.S. Army Research Institute
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Dr. Stanley L. Cohen
Work Unit Area Leader
Organizational Development Work Unit
Army Research Institute for
Behavioral & Social Science
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

AIR FORCE

1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force
Chief, Personnel Research and
Analysis Division (AF/DPSY)
Washington, DC 20330

1 Research and Analysis Division
AF/DPXYR Room 4C200
Washington, DC 20330

1 AFHRL/MD
701 Prince Street
Room 200
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Personnel Research Division
AFHRL
Lackland Air Force Base
Texas 78236

1 AFOSR(NL)
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

1 CAPT Jack Thorpe, USAF
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

MARINE CORPS

1 COL George Caridakis
Director, Office of Manpower Utilization
Headquarters, Marine Corps (A01H)
MCB
Quantico, VA 22134

1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor (Code Ax)
Commandant of the Marine Corps
Washington, DC 20380

1 Mr. E. A. Dover
Manpower Measurement Unit
(Code A01M-2)
Arlington Annex, Room 2413
Arlington, VA 20370

COAST GUARD

1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief
Psychological Research Branch (P-1)
U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters
400 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590

OTHER DOD

1 Lt. Col. Austin W. Kibler, Director
Human Resources Research Office
Advanced Research Projects Agency
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Dr. Ralph R. Canter
Director for Manpower Research
Office of Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon, Room 3C980
Washington, DC 20301

OTHER GOVERNMENT

1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde
Personnel Research & Development Center
U.S. Civil Service Commission, Room 3458
1900 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20415

1 Dr. Very Urry
Personnel Research & Development Center
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, DC 20415

MISCELLANEOUS

1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson
Stanford University
Department of Psychology
Stanford, CA 94305

1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass
University of Rochester
Management Research Center
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Mr. Michael W. Brown
Operations Research, INC.
1400 Spring Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

1 Century Research Corporation
4113 Lee Highway
Arlington, VA 22207

1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark
University of Rochester
College of Arts and Sciences
River Campus Station
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Dr. Rene' V. Dawis
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
N492 Elliott Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

2 ERIC
Processing and Reference Facility
4833 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Dr. Victor Fields
Department of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850

1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman
American Institutes for Research
8555 Sixteenth Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

1 Mr. Paul Foley
Naval Personnel R&D Laboratory
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, DC 20374

1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman
American Institutes for Research
8555 Sixteenth Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

1 Dr. Duncan N. Hansen
Florida State University
Center for Computer-Assisted Instruction
Tallahassee, FL 32306

1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch
Decision Systems Associates, Inc.
11428 Rockville Pike
Rockvill, MD 20852

1 Dr. M.D. Havron
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Westgate Industrial Park
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #3
P.O. Box 5787
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #4, Infantry
P.O. Box 2086
Fort Benning, GA 31905

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #5, Air Defense
P.O. Box 6057
Fort Bliss, TX 79916

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #6, Library
P.O. Box 428
Fort Rucker, AL 36360

1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johson
Lawrence Johnson and Associates, Inc.
200 S Street, N.W., Suite 502
Washington, DC 20009

1 Dr. Norman J. Johnson
Carnegie-Mellon University
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

1 Dr. E. J. McCormick
Purdue University
Department of Psychological Sciences
Lafayette, IN 47907

1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie
Human Factors Research, Inc.
6780 Cortona Drive
Santa Barbara Research Park
Goleta, CA 93017

1 Mr. Edmund Marks
109 Grange Building
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 North Edgewood Street
Arlington, VA 22207

1 Dr. Robert Pritchard
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Purdue University
Lafayette, IN 47907

1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney
Behavioral Technology Laboratories
University of Southern California
3717 South Grand
Los Angeles, CA 90007

1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman
Department of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850

1 Dr. Benjamin Schneider
University of Maryland
Department of Psychology
College Park, MD 20742

1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel
Applied Psychological Services
Science Center
404 East Lancaster Avenue
Wayne, PA 19087

1 Mr. Emanuel P. Somer, Head
Naval Personnel Research and
Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. David J. Weiss
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. Anita West
Denver Research Institute
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80210

1 Dr. Charles A. Ullmann
Director, Behavioral Science Studies
Information Concepts Incorporated
1701 No. Ft. Myer Drive
Arlington, VA 22209